

Appl. No. 09/783,377

REMARKS

Claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 are amended. Claims 21-28, 32-37 and 40-46 are pending in the application.

Claims 21-28, 32-37 and 40-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various cited combinations of the following references: Dunlop, U.S. Patent No. 5,809,393; Xu, U.S. Patent No. 6,451,179; "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" page 639; Takashima, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0014406; Ueda, U.S. Patent No. 5,541,007; and Legresy, U.S. Patent No. 5,160,388. The Examiner is reminded by direction to MPEP § 2143 that a proper obviousness rejection has the following three requirements: 1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings; 2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and 3) the combined references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Pending claims 21-28, 32-37 and 40-46 are allowable over the various cited combinations of Dunlop, Xu, "Aluminum and Aluminum Alloys" (*Aluminum*), Takashima, Ueda and Legresy for at least the reason that the references, individually or as combined, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element in any of those claims.

Each of independent claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 recite materials comprising from greater than 0 ppm to less than or equal to 1000 ppm of dopant materials selected from the recited lists. As acknowledged by the examiner throughout the present action, Dunlop, Ueda, Legresy, Xu and Takashima fail to disclose or suggest materials containing elements selected from the recited list. At pages 10-11 of the present action, the Examiner indicates a position that process steps recited in each of independent claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 do not establish a material difference between the claims and the prior art. The

Appl. No. 09/783,377

Examiner further indicates that *Aluminum* is relied upon as disclosing overlapping ranges of various elements recited in the independent claims since the reference discloses the presence of these elements as impurities as presented in Table 1. Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's statements, each of independent claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 are amended to no longer recite processing steps within the body of the claims. Each of independent claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 are also amended to recite only non-overlapping ranges relative to impurities presented in Table 1 of *Aluminum*. Accordingly, *Aluminum* does not contribute to the recited materials. Considered independently or in combination, *Aluminum*, Dunlop, Ueda, Legresy, Xu and Takashima fail to disclose or suggest each and every limitation recited in the independent claims. Independent claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42 are therefore allowable over the art of record.

Dependent claims 22-28, 33-34, 36-37, 41 and 43-46 are allowable over the various cited combinations of Dunlop, Xu, Takashima, Ueda, Legresy and Aluminum for at least the reason that they depend from corresponding allowable base claims 21, 32, 35, 40 and 42.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 21-28, 32-37 and 40-46 are allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests formal allowance of such claims in the Examiner's next action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 25, 2005

By: Jennifer J. Taylor
Jennifer J. Taylor, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 48,711